

REMARKS

[0005] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11, 13, 14, 16, 20, and 21 are currently pending
- Claims 1, 8, 14, and 21 are amended herein

[0006] Support for the amendments to claims 1, 8, 14, and 21 is found in the specification at least at pages 13 and 14, and Figures 10 and 11 of the original specification.

Claim Objections

[0007] Claims 1, 8, 14, and 21 stand objected because of some typographical errors. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

[0008] Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without commenting on the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claims 1, 8, 14, and 21 as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render the objection moot. During the interview, Applicant's representatives understood the Examiner to agree. Applicant sincerely thanks the Examiner for that indication.

Cheng Fails to Anticipate Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 14, 20, and 21

[0009] Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 14, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Cheng. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicant herein amends independent claims 1, 8, 14, and 21.

Independent Claim 1

[0010] Applicant submits that Cheng does not anticipate claim 1 because it does not disclose at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- generating a mouse path **between** an **actual** current mouse cursor location and an **actual** previous mouse cursor location
...
- displaying, **for each single frame and within each single frame**, a mouse cursor image at each additional determined mouse cursor location **on the generated mouse path, in addition to** displaying a mouse cursor image at the actual current mouse cursor location and at the actual previous mouse cursor location

[0011] In Cheng, as shown in Fig. 2, for each current cursor location, only a **single** cursor location is corrected and displayed. Furthermore, each corrected and displayed cursor location is not on “a mouse path **between** an **actual** current mouse cursor location and an **actual** previous mouse cursor location” as recited in claim 1. As shown in Fig. 3 of Cheng, the corrected mouse track is different from actual mouse track. During the interview, Applicant's representatives understood the Examiner to agree. Applicant sincerely thanks the Examiner for that indication.

[0012] Consequently, Cheng does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Independent Claims 8, 14, and 21

[0013] Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8, 14, and 21 are allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Specifically, Applicant submits that at least the following features are missing in Cheng:

- generating a mouse path between an actual current mouse cursor location and an actual previous mouse cursor location
...
- displaying, for each single frame and within each single frame, a mouse cursor image at each additional determined mouse cursor location on the generated mouse path, in addition to displaying a mouse cursor image at the actual current mouse cursor location and at the actual previous mouse cursor location

[0014] Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Dependent Claims 2, 7, 13, and 20

[0015] Claims 2, 7, 13, and 20 ultimately depend from one of independent claims 1, 8, or 14. As discussed above, claims 1, 8 and 14 are allowable over Cheng. Therefore, claims 2, 7, 13, and 20 are allowable over Cheng by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

[0016] Dependent claims 3, 9, 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Cheng in view of Kensuke. Dependent claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Cheng in view of Chang. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

[0017] As discussed above, at least the following features are missing in Cheng:

- generating a mouse path between an actual current mouse cursor location and an actual previous mouse cursor location
- ...
- displaying, for each single frame and within each single frame, a mouse cursor image at each additional determined mouse cursor location on the generated mouse path, in addition to displaying a mouse cursor image at the actual current mouse cursor location and at the actual previous mouse cursor location

[0018] The reference Kensuke is cited for an enhance mouse cursor, and the reference Chang is cited for motion-blur effect. As discussed during the interview, Kensuke and Chang fail to remedy the deficiencies of Cheng. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of these claims.

Conclusion

[0019] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, **Applicant requests that**

the Examiner contact the undersigned representative before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Chung-Chieh Fang, Reg. No. L0473/ Dated: 10/27/2009
Chung-Chieh Fang (chungchieh@LeeHayes.com; 509-944-4778)
Registration No. L0473

Christopher W. Lattin (christopher@leehayes.com; 509-944-4763)
Registration No. 56,064